



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/587,888	06/06/2000	Austen John Britton	190-1453	8111

7590 08/25/2003
William M Lee Jr
Barnes & Thornburg
P O Box 2786
Chicago, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

GROSS, KENNETH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

13

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/587,888**

Applicant(s) **BRITTON ET AL.**

Examiner **Kenneth A Gross**

Art Unit **2122**

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7,8,13 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7,8,13 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9, 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on June 2nd, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosensteel et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,167,405) in view of Coker (U.S. Patent Number 5,640,550).

In regard to Claim 1, Rosensteel teaches defining a multi-dimensional data warehouse and source databases as a set of entity-relationship data models (Figure 1c, item 12-4 and Column 5, lines 18-27). Rosensteel teaches creating a sequence of SQL statements, which are instructions for loading the multi-dimensional data warehouse from the plurality of source databases (Column 1, lines 58-67 and Column 2, lines 1-5). These statements are obviously stored in a file. Rosensteel does not teach that the source file contains directives, nor does he teach pre-processing the source file by replacing the directives with code, using information pulled from the data models, to generate a destination file containing the code for loading the multi-dimensional data warehouse from a plurality of source databases. Coker, however, does teach processing COBOL instructions by converting to the instructions to SQL code (Column 28, lines 26-35), where the code is generated based on information pulled from the database

Art Unit: 2122

(Column 4, lines 58-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention to define a multi-dimensional data warehouse and source databases as a set of entity-relationship data models, create a sequence of SQL statements, which are instructions for loading the multi-dimensional data warehouse from the plurality of source databases, as taught by Rosensteel, where the instructions are converted into SQL code where the code is generated based on information pulled from the database, as taught by Coker, since this allows the user to write source code statements for a database without knowing the details of the database. Claims 7, 13, and 16 correspond directly with Claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1.

3. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosensteel et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,167,405) in view of Coker (U.S. Patent Number 5,640,550) and further in view of Access 97 Macro & VBA Handbook by Susann Novalis, 1997 (hereinafter Novalis) and Backes et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,231,693).

In regard to Claim 2, Rosensteel and Coker teach the method of Claim 1, but do not teach that some of the directives define macro substitutions, where the macro substitutions comprise inserting a run-time processor macro for processing at run time. Novalis, however, teaches that VBA programming in Microsoft Access 97 allows for macros to be used, where macro substitutions are performed on the source code (Chapter 5, page 1, lines 1 and lines 9-10). Novalis does not teach that these macros are run-time processor macros. Backes, however, does teach binding of macros, where the macros are processed at run-time (Column 9, lines 53-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform the method of claim 1, where some of the directives define macro substitutions, as taught by Novalis, and the macro substitutions comprise inserting a run-time

Art Unit: 2122

processor macro for processing at run time, as taught by Backes, since this allows macros to processed when information needed to process the macros is available. Claim 8 corresponds directly with Claim 2, and is rejected for the same reasons as Claim 2.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Nguyen et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,737,592)

Bollay (U.S. Patent Number 6,457,009)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth A Gross whose telephone number is (703) 305-0542. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

KAG



TUAN Q. DAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER